30th October 1935]

(*f*) what the cases are of new expenditure, which the President, Salem District Board, has so far brought before the Government for their sanction since 1st January 1935, and what the amount involved in each is; and

(*g*) in which of the cases the Government have refused their sanction, and for what reasons?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) G.O. No. 2592, L. & M., dated 4th July 1935, is placed on the table.[a]

(*c*) The proposal was recommended by the Director of Public Instruction subject to certain conditions. The Government have no information whether the proposal was recommended by the District Secondary Education Board and the District Educational Officer.

(*d*) The Government consider that no useful purpose will be served by placing those communications on the table.

(*e*) Details of non-recurring expenditure were not furnished by the President, District Board. The recurring expenditure was estimated by the Board at Rs. 780.

(*f*) & (*g*) Opening of Form V in the Board High School, Attur, is one at a cost of Rs. 1,020, recurring. No details were furnished regarding non-recurring expenditure. Sanction was refused on educational grounds. The Government do not propose to collect information regarding the other cases.

Representations for the abolition of tax on cycles in municipal areas.

* 287 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether representations have been received from Madras City or from any other municipality or from private individuals or associations urging for an enactment for the abolition of tax on cycles in municipal areas; and

(*b*) if so, from whom and how they have been disposed of?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) Representations were received from the Corporation of Madras, a public meeting of the cyclists of Madras and the Triplicane Sociological Brotherhood requesting Government to drop the cycle-tax from the Madras City Municipal Amending Bill, but the Government did not accept the suggestion. No representation on the subject has been received from any mufassal municipal council.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on pages 224–225 infra.

[30th October 1935

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—" May I know what the income derived is from cycle-tax in the city? "

The Hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" I am not sure. Probably it will be Rs. 75,000."

Alleged misconduct of Mr. Adisheshayya, ex-Special Officer, Bezwada Municipality.

* 288 *Q.*—Mrs. A. Rukmani Lakshmipathi : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether allegations of grave misconduct have been made to the Government against Mr. B. Adiseshayya, ex-Special Officer, Bezwada Municipality, by Mr. C. K. Reddi, M.L.C.; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that he postponed the election of the Chairman of the Bezwada Municipality in contravention of the orders passed by the Government?

A.—(*a*) Certain allegations were made against Mr. Adiseshayya by Mr. Reddi.

(*b*) The Special Officer adjourned the election on the ground that there was no valid notice to the councillors in respect of the election. The Government approved his action.

Amount of toll compensation paid to the District Boards of Coimbatore and Salem as the second instalment for 1935–36.

* 289 *Q.*—Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the actual income from tolls in the Coimbatore and Salem districts for the three years ending 1930–31 is; and

(*b*) what the amount authorized for payment in the second instalment for 1935–36 to the District Boards of Coimbatore and Salem under the Madras Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, is?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) A statement[a] is laid on the table.

Delay in the reconstitution of village panchayats under the Local Boards (Amendment) Act.

* 290 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many elections to the village panchayats in each district after the introduction of the new Local Boards Act have not yet taken place;

(*b*) how many times each panchayat was extended without conducting the elections;

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VI on pages 225–226 infra.